From:	MCCLINCY Matt
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; ANDERSON Jim M
Cc:	Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; BAYUK Dana
Subject:	RE: Deep Groundwater Plumes and TZW
Date:	05/31/2007 05:20 PM

Eric,

The Gunderson plume is a moderate concentration VOC plume. Hydraulic containment measures have been initiated and will continue to be evaluated as to their effectiveness and augmented as necessary. I expect the in-water remedy will be natural attenuation so I am not going to get too excited about additional TZW. Jim - chime in here if you disagree.

In the March e-mail, Dana made recommendations for additional TZW work that should provide a more complete picture of the VOC plume distribution and possible higher TZW concentrations associated with the deeper portion of the plume.

Is the additional TZW characterization necessary? Maybe this is a good site to run through the groundwater risk framework you are working on. For example, does the existing TZW data exceed a SLV? If it does, would the additional data likely change the outcome of an FS? If the TZW data does not exceed an SLV would the TZW associated with the deeper portion of the plume exceed?

Matt

-----Original Message-----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
[mailto:Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 11:18 AM
To: ANDERSON Jim M; MCCLINCY Matt
Cc: Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Deep Groundwater Plumes and TZW

The issue of deep groundwater offshore of RPAC has been identified as a potential "new site" in our discussions with the LWG. In the LWG's July 25, 2005 letter documenting our agreements for moving forward with the TZW sampling, we identified four sites where deep groundwater is a potential issue: Siltronic, RPAC, Gunderson and GASCO. Siltronic and GASCO have moved forward. RPAC has been identified. What about Gunderson? Based on the information that Matt provided in March, Gunderson could be a candidate as well. What do you think?

Thanks, Eric